

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
February 12, 2013
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Deeds, Segreto, Cella, Steel, Gieseke, Jacobson, Jones, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Segreto, Cella, Steel, Gieseke, Jacobson, Jones, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, approving the consent agenda as follows:

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Ayes: Members Deeds, Segreto, Cella, Steel, Gieseke, Jacobson, Jones, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Edible Playground Public Hearing – Lewis Park

Member Segreto commented, as she read through the letters, a lot of them felt the location selected was not a sunny location. Kristin Aarsvold, Recreation Supervisor, indicated she will talk with Bob Prestrud, Parks Foreman, because that was one of the areas he suggested and thought it would get enough sunlight. She thinks they can move it a little bit in order to get more sunlight. Member Jones stated that if they do decide to move ahead with this she would like to make sure that is part of the condition that the location get at least 8 hours of sunlight.

Member Deeds suggested maybe putting up some netting for the soccer balls. Ms. Aarsvold replied they will look into that and as problems arise they will be looking at some problem solving. Member Hulbert asked how close it is to the soccer fields because they may no longer be resting a field so there will be a lot more activity. Ms. Aarsvold replied Mr. Prestrud didn't feel they would have any issues with soccer and they will go out again in the spring to make sure they are meeting the requirement of 8 hours of sunlight and will then give the exact location. Ms. Kattreh added she did talk to the Edina Soccer Club and they had no concerns in that area.

Member Jones indicated this is going to cost quite a bit of money and knows that a grant has been requested as well as some pledges have been obtained but because they can't pull \$11,000 out of the air she would like to at least set a stipulation that all of the pledges and grants be obtained before anything is started. Ms. Aarsvold replied absolutely and in her timeline it states they will not do

anything until those funds are secured in an account that the City has designated for the edible playground.

Member Jones indicated that in the past they had talked about using the irrigation system of the soccer field to spray onto the garden and she is concerned because they are looking at putting in a wood fence. It seems like this would be a recipe for it to rot at an earlier age than it would need to and wondered if there was another plan for that. Ms. Aarsvold replied that she will be going to a “School Yard Garden Workshop” on February 22 at the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum so she is learning as she goes and they will need to come up with a Plan B on how they will get water out to the site. She stated she has no problem letting 30 children carry buckets of water from a park building because part of this is the effort the kids are putting into it and they could possibly run a hose and make it a fun activity; however, the main purpose is for them to have fun and hopefully produce some good, healthy food.

Member Jones asked if the edible garden will be locked to which Ms. Aarsvold replied yes, they will have a padlock on both the shed and front gate. Member Jones asked so they are not envisioning this to be open at all to the community to which Ms. Aarsvold explained it’s really designed for the kids who are registered in the playground program and their families. She noted they did discuss there may be an opportunity to do a “realtor” type box where they could have a key if a family wanted to come. She also stated she is going to plan a few nights where the kids can come with their families to an open house type thing. Member Jones asked if the school type gardens are locked during the off hours to which Ms. Aarsvold replied she doesn’t know. Member Jones indicated that she is a little reluctant because the rest of their parks while they may be scheduled at certain times the rest of the time they are open to the community. She stated she is a little uncomfortable with it being only offered to only 30 kids and not having it available or open any other time. Ms. Aarsvold replied she knows that Eden Prairie does lock their garden mainly as a deterrent to keep out vandals, etc. She noted that a school yard garden is designated for kids who attend that certain school and that they did look at it as a programming opportunity for the kids who attend Lewis Park; however, anyone who lives in Edina can register for the playground program at Lewis Park. She explained they are hoping that it becomes a unique way for them to build a little program at Lewis so for kids who like gardening will say they want sign for the playground program at Lewis Park.

Member Jones commented that she thought she saw somewhere that they were going to target certain students to be participants and asked is it going to be open and accessible to all students to which Ms. Aarsvold replied absolutely. Member Jones asked they are not going to be giving preferential treatment to anyone to which Ms. Aarsvold replied no. Ms. Aarsvold explained they can take 75 kids at the Lewis Park site and typically they get around 30 who sign up and this location has never filled. She noted that she will be marketing to the kids who live in the Oaklawn Apartments in that they will have a flyer in their lobby to let them know this is happening. In addition, she will be working with the Creek Valley ELL teacher to get some information out to those students; however, anyone is more than welcome to sign up. She noted that there will also be three camps offered in August that anyone can register for.

Member Deeds pointed out that he actually doesn’t see this any different than when they lock the locker rooms at Braemar Arena. In fact, we probably have a lot of facilities that we lock up and are only used for specific sports teams or specific undertakings that are not directly open to the public. He stated this is a small space; they are not taking up a large chunk of the park so he doesn’t think it changes the way in which they operate and doesn’t see that as a particular concern.

Member Jones noted that in looking at the drawings if a soccer ball were to go in there would we need to lock it up because there will be more damage done trying to climb over the fence than just leaving it open. She added they are really not keeping out any vandals with locking a 4 foot high fence. Ms. Aarsvold responded she is open to leaving it unlocked if the Park Board is open to leaving it unlocked. She noted that is something she will ask about at the workshop she will be attending.

Member Jacobson commented another good reason to lock it would be to prevent the deer and other animals from coming in it. Ms. Aarsvold replied she will also talk with Mr. Prestrud and see what he would suggest.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Cella, to approve the edible garden in Lewis Park.

Member Jones reiterated the conditions that there be eight hours of sunlight during the summer and all funding is secured as stated in the document.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Segreto, Cella, Steel, Gieseke, Jacobson, Jones, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

VI.A. Yorktown Park Pilot Community Garden Rules and Policies –

Ms. Faus informed the Park Board their initial step in coming up with these rules and policies was to assemble a working group and their first step in defining the rules and policies was to do some research and find out what other cities have adopted for policies and rules. In addition, they contacted the “MRPA” as well as “Resource Gardening Matters”. She noted after they collected the information and spent some time looking through all of the different rules and policies the other cities have developed they created that chart. She indicated they presented a draft of these rules and policies to the community garden working group at the January 30 meeting. They provided some great suggestions, additions and changes and are now looking for Park Board’s approval of the rules and policies for the Yorktown Community Garden Pilot project.

Member Deeds asked is this set up as essentially organic produce and the rules are such to which Ms. Faus replied that is correct.

Member Segreto indicated under number two of the regulations it states that returning gardeners will be given first preference the following year and asked if that is what they have found in their research or do some cities do it by a lottery. Ms. Faus replied some cities do use a lottery but the majority of the cities did it by priority where if you had a garden one year the next year you were given priority. She added that they certainly could look at doing a lottery system for the following year. Member Segreto stated that may be a decision to make after you gauge what the interest in the garden is and asked how many plots will there be. Ms. Faus replied they are starting out with approximately 50 plots and that the nice thing about the location they are selecting is there could possibly be room for expansion if they find the gardens are extremely popular. Member Cella indicated that also is the only regulation that struck her as something she would question. She stated they should agree to revisit that at the end of this gardening season to see what the demand for those plots were because she would hate to see people who know nothing about it at the start and then would not be able to have one because of others who were able to get them first would always have those plots.

Member Jones commented that she thinks one of the reasons some community gardens do it by priority is because there becomes an active group community that takes care of the garden and in order for that to happen there usually is some type of legacy and things like that. She stated she would

suggest in that section, whether they are going to use a lottery or not, to keep the stipulation that would be giving priority to former garden plot holders; however, if their garden had not been maintained they would lose their priority.

Member Deeds stated that he would like to see approximately a 50% turnover every year. He indicated it's really a question to review these after the second year to see what kind of turnover they are getting or are they getting locked up. It's an empirical question and until they run it they won't know. Ms. Faus pointed out when they were putting the rules and regulations together they realized they may have to make some changes next year and that it's going to be trial and error so they will take some great notes and make sure they are ready to make certain changes needed for the following year.

Member Jones asked if they have any idea how many Edina residents will actually sign up for this to which Ms. Kattreh replied they haven't had the opportunity to actually do a survey but that the gardens will be open to Edina residents first and they will not open them up to non-residents unless they have extra space available after a certain date. She noted they were given this project in December so they haven't had an opportunity to gauge interest; however, based on the information they've seen from their neighboring communities they are popular and do fill up.

Member Deeds asked about raised beds to which Ms. Faus replied they decided to not offer raised beds this year just because of their time and financial constraints but certainly will look at adding those in phase two next year.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented just a consideration on the waiver it references "my child" and she is not sure that this is necessarily a program geared for children so you may want to consider changing it to say "my family".

Member Jones pointed out that in the garden plots she is familiar with they do not allow hoses because of the amount of water that can be wasted; therefore, she would recommend that they don't allow the use of hoses especially since they will be bringing in water with their water buffalo. Ms. Kattreh commented that is a discussion they have been going back and forth on and they are very interested in Park Board's input. She noted it is something they will certainly be talking about further with the working group and they've gone both ways because that was exactly their concern. She stated they don't want to create a hardship for people to have to carry water long distances so they are certainly open to any suggestions.

Member Deeds asked is there a reason for no pets to which Ms. Faus replied the cities that have a community garden all have a no pet policy but she does not know the exact reason why, possibly out of respect for the other gardeners. Member Jacobson suggested maybe they should be more specific about the language regarding pets in that they are allowed in the general area but not in the planting area because then it would be about waste and food and not having the two mix.

Member Jones asked Ms. Kattreh if she is proposing they are going to talk about rules and regulations further in the working group. Ms. Kattreh replied they are asking for approval of the rules and regulations tonight so if there are any changes anyone would like to see made they could certainly do that. She commented in their meeting in January they handed out the rules and they asked for people to submit any changes to them to which those changes have already been incorporated into the rules. Member Jones stated that she would like to add "If weeds are growing 12" tall on more than 1/3 of your plot or if you've extended your plot beyond the assigned boundary lines you will be contacted by the park district by phone or email. You will need to respond to this communication. Gardeners will then have two weeks from the day we notify you to take the appropriate action before the plot will be

mowed. You're expected to maintain your plot during any extended absences". She noted this specifies the process and it is the weeds that make it such an eyesore which is also why she suggests this. Ms. Faus pointed out that in addition to the rules and regulations they are also working on an application form which lists gardener expectations and that would be another area where they could include the specific part about the weeds. Member Jones noted that in general she agrees with what was laid out; however, since they want to welcome people to the gardens maybe there is a way that they could word it to make it friendlier as well as more welcoming and encouraging. She noted when people are signing up for a garden plot they want it to be a fun experience and feels it could be worded a little bit differently.

Chair Steel asked if there will be any resources for first time planters to which Ms. Faus replied yes, there will be some master gardeners to work with the people and they are also hoping to have a master gardener available on certain nights for people who may want further advice.

Chair Steel asked if an issue comes up in July that we didn't anticipate how that will be approached. Ms. Kattreh replied they are going to be setting up a gardeners committee that will have a staff representative as well as a smaller representation of the working group that will include some actual gardeners in the community garden. This group will help to mediate any issues they may have.

Member Jones asked will this area be locked to which Ms. Faus replied they hadn't planned on locking the area. Member Jones asked what the difference is between this garden and the garden at Lewis Park. Member Hulbert replied it isn't close to a general field area and there are not going to be soccer balls flying around. Member Cella pointed out this is designated as a community garden; the other garden at Lewis Park is part of the playground program where you sign up to participate in it with a fee so for example instead of signing up for a soccer camp they are signing up for a garden camp. She noted her understanding is kids are there gardening under the supervision of park personnel where with the community garden anyone who has a plot can come in when they feel like gardening. Ms. Kattreh replied that she would totally concur; both programs are considered to be pilot programs and they are doing their best to utilize the great resources they have in terms of people on their working group as well as the resources they've been able to collect through MRPA. She stated they will be reviewing this constantly and will be prepared to make any changes to make it a successful experience for all participants.

Member Hulbert noted that one of the rules states that priority is given to Edina residents but thinks there may be an education curve for residents who don't know that a community garden exists. He indicated that if it takes a little while for this to fill up and only 25 residents step up the first year and then residents from other communities come in he would still like to see that subsequent years Edina residents will have some sort of precedence over plots versus other community residents. Ms. Faus replied what they anticipate doing next year is having a registration period probably in January made available first to previous gardeners as well as Edina residents and if there are still plots available the following month open it up to non-residents. Member Jacobson asked should the non-resident fee be higher than the resident fee to which Ms. Faus replied in their research they did not find that other cities offered different rates for residents and non-residents. She added some cities only made the garden available for residents and is something that could be a possibility.

Member Gieseke asked do non-residents retain the right as returning gardeners to keep their plot year after year. Ms. Faus replied that her initial answer would be no because even though they were a previous gardener Edina residents would have first priority and that may need to be specified more in the rules. Member Deeds suggested that they list the priorities: priority #1 is for returning gardeners

who are Edina residents; priority #2 is for Edina residents; priority #3 is for returning non-Edina residents, etc., so that everybody understands the priorities.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, to approve the proposed Yorktown Park Community Garden Rules and Policies

Member Cella stated some of the suggestions that have been made and everyone has agreed to be appropriate should be incorporated into the rules and procedures on the final document.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Segreto, Cella, Steel, Gieseke, Jacobson, Jones, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

VI.C. Yorktown Park Pilot Community Garden Parking

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board as she mentioned before they have a very aggressive timeline to get this project done by the middle of May. She noted in looking at the timeline they had February 1 as a goal to have their rules and policies set and noted they are working on location and parking. She indicated the next big thing for the Park Board will be to hold a public hearing at the next Park Board meeting. She indicated they are finalizing a site plan with the Engineering Department and hope to have a mailing out the beginning of next week to notify neighbors within 1,000 feet of the property. She noted if it receives Park Board approval they will take it to the City Council on their April 2 meeting and after that they will start construction.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that in January Ms. Faus and she met with Greg Hanks from the YMCA because they realized that parking is an issue at Yorktown Park. She noted they looked at a couple of options and the first option was to approach the YMCA and see if they might be interested in a shared parking on their back lot. She indicated what came from that meeting was a possible partnership opportunity with the YMCA. She pointed out that the YMCA does run into a lot of parking capacity issues in their lot at a variety of times during the day and during the year and so they did express some concern about using their parking lot for the community garden. She indicated that they talked about the fact that during the summer is when the YMCA is not as busy and is when the community garden would never have more than 10 to 15 cars in the parking lot; however, they still had concern because during the summer is when they run a lot of camp programs and the buses that come out of the back parking lot. Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that what was proposed, at least very tentatively in the early stages, was a partnership with the YMCA on creating a parking lot at the very corner of Yorktown Park adjacent to the existing YMCA parking lot. She stated again they are in the very early stages but the YMCA is proposing that they would actually build and maintain that parking lot on Yorktown Park property and give Yorktown Park City of Edina users access to that parking lot year around. She noted that would be two great benefits for the city, one is it would be a dedicated parking lot for the community garden, which they don't have access to parking anywhere else and it would also give them a great opportunity to provide a trailhead parking lot for the Nine Mile Creek Trail which is going to be just on the very northern edge of the community garden. She stressed that she told the YMCA that it was important she first had this discussion with the Park Board to see if you had any interest in her pursuing this any further.

Member Gieseke stated that it looks like it's a reasonable request. His concern is it's shared space so would there be signage that designates certain time periods for use by the community garden in case there is overflow from the current YMCA situation that it fills to capacity. Ms. Kattreh replied they have not taken their conversations to that level yet but would anticipate they would want to assign certain spots as community garden parking only.

Member Segreto indicated her concern is right now the community garden is somewhat of an experiment and if they enter into an agreement to build a parking lot and the garden does not succeed then they have a parking lot; however, it could be used for parking in the future for the bike trail which also has some risk involved. She stated she would like to be open to the idea but she doesn't see them judiciously doing it the first year and therefore would like to tell the YMCA it would be good for the City to have a parking lot there but not hinged on this first year.

Member Segreto asked about the shared bathroom situation and what will the gardeners do, will they walk into the YMCA and use their bathrooms. Ms. Kattreh replied they did have that discussion and the YMCA is open to that; although it's probably not ideal for them or for the gardeners because of the distance people would need to travel. She noted the YMCA has offered to add a port-a-potty to that area for the community garden. Member Segreto commented that there are some residents who have negative feelings about port-a-potties, especially older residents. Ms. Kattreh responded they certainly have considered the aesthetic concerns of a port-a-potty in that area and if they extend it beyond a pilot program she could see them building some sort of a perimeter shelter around the building to help shield it.

Member Cella asked how the green space they are looking at for the garden plots and proposed parking lot is currently being used during the summer. Ms. Kattreh replied that it is not programmed; however, the YMCA used to use it for some of their athletic programs but no longer use it. She added it is not programmed and receives very little use because of the access and lack of parking.

Member Deeds indicated it would solve the permeability problem if they could do a gravel parking lot with some drain tile and assorted other things. It solves the water run-off problem, makes it relatively inexpensive and makes it reversible if necessary. He stated if the demand is there then they can go back and put in some kind of asphalt or preferably some kind of permeable surface. He stated he is actually a little more concerned about the water run-off and the permeability and we need to quit building non-permeable parking lots.

Ms. Kattreh pointed out that part of the approval process for a parking lot would require Watershed District approval and they could certainly explore any option the Park Board would be interested in having staff explore. She indicated they do not have a budget for the community garden so they are going to be asking the City Council to allocate some funding for the garden and they certainly do not have money in the budget to even provide a temporary parking lot. She noted she could explore this with the YMCA but she is not sure they would be interested in funding a parking lot that would be used for just the summer because they need a parking lot during the winter as well. She indicated if there are concerns about the viability of the community garden for a year or two they might be better off putting the garden where they would put it and see if they could work out an arrangement with the YMCA to share their parking lot in the meantime. Member Deeds asked is the community garden viable without a parking lot to which Ms. Kattreh replied no, they definitely need parking in that area.

Member Jacobson commented if they do a parking lot with the YMCA parking lot it makes it seem like it's the YMCA's parking lot. She suggested they put a little barrier or somehow separate it in a way so that it doesn't look like it's the YMCA's parking lot. Ms. Kattreh replied they could certainly explore that and noted that during the working group meeting Member Jones asked if there is another way to gain access to that parking lot and there really isn't another viable option. She stated that she understands the concerns but would like to reiterate that she really does feel that it would be a large benefit to the Nine Mile Creek Trail as a drop off point for bikes.

Member Deeds commented that the downside risk is essentially they give up a piece of parkland that is essentially unused at this point to which Ms. Kattreh replied that is correct. Member Deeds stated so we give them the land and the YMCA is going to take all of the expenses and build a parking lot, they get additional parking and we get use of a parking lot that may be good for the community garden and may well be really beneficial to Nine Mile Creek down the road. He noted the downside is that never happens and the YMCA gets a parking lot. Member Hulbert stated we are not giving the land away we are just letting them put a parking lot on it. Member Deeds responded there will be a contractual agreement that there will be parking there but the downside risk is we are giving up some land in exchange for to put a parking lot in.

Member Gieseke stated that land is essentially not programmed and if they have a parking lot maybe they can utilize it in a different capacity maybe even year around if they want to take advantage of that. He asked Ms. Kattreh if any thought has been given to enhancing the fire station that is there by adding 20 stalls or something like that. Ms. Kattreh replied they have not had that discussion but that they do have some constraints there with the access because there is a bridge with an underpass where the promenade carries through. She noted she would not say that it's not feasible but it would be very difficult with an emergency vehicle access in that area. She added she is not quite sure how it would fit and how the Fire Department would feel about having residential traffic going through the parking lot with their emergency vehicles.

Member Jones commented that she doesn't understand why they would want to put in a 40 stall parking lot for a community garden that has 40 plots. She stated she is really opposed to taking up any open space parkland for excessive parking and does not think that serves their community well and doesn't think that is part of the long-term goal for the park district which is to keep open space in parks. She noted maybe they could look into adding parking spaces by the Fire Department and the community garden would be served with far fewer than 40 parking spaces. She pointed out that most people who signed the petition live in the Durham Apartments and those people wouldn't even need parking spaces. She indicated she wants to go very, very slowly on paving over parkland and if the secondary process is to say we need it for a trailhead for Nine Mile Creek there are many places where there is parking near Nine Mile Creek.

Member Cella stated that she shares Member Jones concern about paving over green space but if they are committed to putting in a community garden they also need to be committed to provide some place for people who don't live in the Durham Apartments to park. She pointed out if they want to utilize the community garden and they have no space for them to park then it's not worth going ahead with the garden project. They need to somehow make it accessible to as many Edina residents as possible and therefore they have to solve the parking problem. Member Jones replied she is not suggesting that they not solve a parking problem but she doesn't think they need 40 spaces.

Chair Steel indicated there are a lot of people who will be using the Nine Mile Creek trail and asked Ms. Kattreh if she could look into other trail heads. Chair Steel commented from her own experience she has seen 10 cars and trailers at the trailhead by Wayzata so she knows they do take up some space and ask if staff could check with other cities that have the Three Rivers Park District trail and get an idea. Ms. Kattreh replied she would be more than happy to do that. Ms. Kattreh explained the 40 spots came from the YMCA and they are looking at making approximately a \$70,000 investment in this parking lot so they are going to want to make it to meet their needs as well because we do not need 40 spots for a community garden or trailhead. This is just one opportunity to get a parking lot for the amenity we are proposing.

Member Deeds asked if parking were put in is the open space that is there programmable in the sense of putting in an athletic field, what is the current condition of it because maybe the 40 spaces could be useful for that too. Member Hulbert responded the YMCA used to program youth soccer for Pre-Kindergarten/Kindergarten so it's a good size for that. Member Gieseke commented they used to have two or three games going on at once. Ms. Kattreh indicated if they had a parking lot it would give them the ability to do some programming there.

Member Jones stated that she does think they could use at least 10 spots for the Nine Mile Creek Trail and suggested staff should go back to the YMCA and say can we add on ten spots because that would help them and they can see how it is used this year and if they need more than ten spots they can talk about it next year.

Member Gieseke noted that Richfield is right on the border and are also part of the Tri-City Skate Park so they have an interest and maybe it's worthwhile to talk to them about the cul-de-sac that is there and expanding some kind of parking around there even with access from the YMCA Edina side there. He added it may be a more pleasant way to go about this and less green space would be eaten up. He commented he is assuming, because this is adjacent to Richfield, there is going to be some Richfield response to the community garden plus there are some access issues for Richfield for the Tri-city Skate Park. Chair Steel replied she doesn't see Richfield being as open to funding but maybe Three Rivers Park District is. Ms. Kattreh responded she has not had any conversations with Three Rivers Park District at this point. She indicated that given their time constraints she probably won't have the opportunity to explore parking opportunities on any of these other venues. She stated that if the Park Board is not interested in pursuing a parking option with the YMCA right now then she will need to discuss with them the viability of sharing a lot and she is not sure what their answer would be.

Member Deeds asked the current utilization of this park is there are no programs scheduled and it's a bunch of grass to which Ms. Kattreh replied it's underutilized. Member Deeds asked so without parking it's going to remain underutilized to which Ms. Kattreh replied that is correct. Member Deeds asked so with parking in conjunction with the YMCA not only does it open up the community gardens but it opens up the potential for other programs and other utilizations to which Ms. Kattreh replied that is correct, yes.

Chair Steel stated that the sentiment she is sensing from the Park Board is that we want minimal parking spaces that are the most environmentally friendly, but that we do need parking.

Member Hulbert indicated we are committed to doing this community garden and thinks it's going to be successful and a lot of people are going to want to use it and it was his thought that a parking lot would cost them approximately \$50,000. He stated if the YMCA wants to step up and pay \$70,000 for a parking lot he would like to play ball and doesn't think the YMCA is going to want to give them 10 to 20 stalls for a community garden if the area is not being used. He stated Edina needs more dog parks, more youth small soccer fields, etc., and he doesn't want to look at this and say we just want our 10 stalls because they are not going to want to do it and we are missing an opportunity.

Member Jones asked isn't there an elevation change in the area they are talking about for a potential field to which Ms. Kattreh replied in that area the elevation is pretty flat. Member Jones stated speaking for open space that area is really built up and if they are already taking up a quarter of the park for a community garden there are people who do enjoy walking on grassy areas and having a place to throw a Frisbee and there is no other place in this area to do that. Ms. Kattreh commented there is a park adjacent on the eastern side that is in Richfield. Member Jones commented if the park is underutilized it's not very well landscaped and it feels fairly industrialized with that skate park and

feels it could use more trees. She stated she doesn't think this is an ideal site for a soccer field and thinks there are other fields that would make it feel better as you're biking or as you're walking around but thinks it is not the most ideal setting for a ball field. Member Hulbert replied kids have played soccer there all of the time and they could ride their bike to the soccer field if it's right on the promenade and it would still have a green space.

Member Segreto noted she is sensitive to the open space argument and agrees with Member Jones that 40 spaces seems like a lot but for them to have the garden they need to have parking and thinks they should take the opportunity of a partnership with the YMCA because it's a good opportunity. She commented that she doesn't know what the magic number is for the YMCA to say okay we will do the construction but she suspects that it's not 10 spaces. She added 20 spaces feels better and that it can always be enlarged but maybe that's a good start. Member Hulbert replied she has a feeling they are going to say however many spots we want they are going to want at least that same amount.

Member Deeds stated Edina is a dense city with very little space and here they have an underutilized piece of land and it's underutilized because there is no place to park to make use of it. He indicated the YMCA is willing to spend money to put in 40 spots which makes it a useful piece of land for a much broader array whether it's a ball field, Nine Mile Creek Trailhead, skating rink, he doesn't know what is appropriate in there but it makes it a useful space. As it stands right now it is underutilized and not useful space and we need to spend money mowing it. Member Segreto responded if we do this parking lot we are encumbering the land with a long-term easement and shared agreement. She added when they talk about strategic planning this park does not have a strategic plan so we don't know what the fate of this park will be in the future.

Chair Steel reiterated to the Park Board that Ms. Kattreh brought this to them to have their first discussion and mull it over and if it is something they are going to want to consider they are not going to be able to pick the magic number that the YMCA will decide on tonight. She asked the Park Board how they would feel if Ms. Kattreh went back to the YMCA and asked them what the best offer is they can give us and then we can take a look at that.

Member Gieseke commented that he agrees with Member Jones in that they don't want to make it too industrial but they do need parking and it makes sense and is reasonable because it's zero expense to the city. He stated he is concerned about the look and asked if they could be greedy and tell them they would like 30 spots instead of 40 as well as ask if they would put some greenery around it to make the park look pretty. Ms. Kattreh replied she would be happy to ask for anything that is suggested.

Member Jones indicated on the agenda it says this item is for discussion yet Ms. Kattreh is the one who will be moving forward on this. She asked Ms. Kattreh if there is feedback she would like to hear from each board member to help make the discussion useful so that you are not only hearing from a few members. Ms. Kattreh replied it was difficult for her to put this on the agenda because they are so early in the stage in that they don't have an offer on the table from the YMCA; therefore, she is having a hard time asking for approval for something because there is no offer for you to approve. She stated that she certainly understands everyone's concern for green space and she shares those concerns. She indicated that in bringing the request for the 40 spots it was based on a request from the YCMA for 40 to 50 spots and she capped it at 40 spots. She stated if the recommendation from the board was to go back and ask for 25 or 30 spots that kind of feedback would be most helpful and yes, it would be helpful to hear from everyone in one way, shape or form. She noted she can be in touch with the board over the next month to let you how it's proceeding. She informed the Park Board that their next phase is the public hearing phase and the approval of the project from the Park Board. She noted at that point if the board is not interested they can talk about taking it out or go back to the YMCA with

another revision. She pointed out this project has been made very difficult because of the short time frame they are working on and added that she literally doesn't have two weeks in play to delay the project and wishes they could do it differently.

Chair Steel stated that it is hard to come up with a number without knowing what programs we could have in the future; therefore, she thinks it would be helpful to have a few realistic ideas because if they build this parking lot she wants to use the entire park.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board one thing they have not mentioned is they would like to do some programming at the community garden and that they already have some interest from Fairview Southdale Hospital in holding some clinics and gardening activities. She added that she sees this as a community meeting space so, in addition to any possible recreational use of that space; she also sees it as an educational programming site.

Member Deeds stated that he would recommend that the Park Board trust Ms. Kattreh and empower her to continue the conversations with the YMCA. He thinks it's reasonable to at least capture this conversation and see what the YMCA is willing to do. He would like to see a motion that simply empowers Ms. Kattreh to continue the conversation and see where it's negotiated out and see what the offer looks like.

Member Jones stated she assumes they would be talking about a long-term easement for getting access to that park to which Ms. Kattreh replied absolutely and that the City Attorney will help draw up some long-term agreements for the use of this parking lot.

Chair Steel asked if they have enough time to get the public hearing notice out. Ms. Kattreh responded the public hearing notice they have drawn up does include a parking lot and noted they have been working with the Engineering Department to get that ready. She stated they could take it out and use verbiage that the parking lot is subject to change but that is what they are planning unless the Park Board is absolutely not interested in this option. Member Jones stated that to be fair to the residents in the area they need to be very specific about what type and size of a parking lot and garden they are proposing in their neighborhood park. Ms. Kattreh replied they have a parking lot drawn out that right now has 40 spots. Member Cella asked so basically the decision for them right now is do they send the public meeting notice with or without a parking lot. Ms. Kattreh responded that is correct and she absolutely agrees they want to try to make it as accurate as they possibly can and in this case if anything they would error on the side of a larger parking lot.

Member Kathryn Peterson indicated she agrees that in order to support the community garden they need parking and they need to take better advantage of this space as mentioned. It's a shame it is not being better used at this point and feels having parking there would support that or some other programming.

VI.D. 2013 Park Board Work Plan Schedule

Ms. Kattreh reminded the Park Board that at their last meeting she was asked to put together a more detailed calendar to show how they would be able to achieve all of the goals they have set for 2013 and is interested in any feedback, comment or changes the Park Board would like to see made. Chair Steel pointed out that she is working with Ms. Kattreh to shepherd the strategic planning process and pulled those items together because she thought that might be a doable timeline; however, she is completely open for suggestions. She noted that at the next Park Board meeting they will start digging into the strategic planning process and hopefully it will become much clearer how that will unfold.

Member Hulbert made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke, to approve the 2013 Park Board Work Plan Schedule.

Ayes: Member Deeds, Segreto, Cella, Steel, Gieseke, Jacobson, Jones, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

VI.E. Monarch Way Station at Arneson Acres Park

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that the Garden Club “Late Bloomers” is proposing to add a “Monarch Way Station” at Arneson Acres Park. She stated they think it’s going to be a big draw that could actually receive some recognition from the National Monarch Society and added that it will be a native plant garden.

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, to approve the Monarch Way Station at Arneson Acres Park.

Member Segreto asked if the butterflies are going to be tagged as part of the tracking system because it’s really important to know where they are migrating and kids get excited about putting labels on the wings. Ms. Kattreh indicated they had not mentioned that but she will talk to them about it.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Segreto, Cella, Steel, Gieseke, Jacobson, Jones, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson
Motion Carried

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

VII.A. COUNCIL UPDATES

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that Chair Steel has asked that she put together a compilation of City Council agenda items that directly impact Parks and Recreation or the Park Board. Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that the City Council did vote 3-2 to change the residency percentage for the Edina Swim Club to receive priority access to the aquatic center and to be the recognized swimming association in Edina. She noted that it went from 75% to 60% and they are currently working to negotiate with the Edina Swim Club and Aqua Jets to determine an agreeable use of pool time this summer.

Member Jones asked for a copy of the new agreement once it’s done to which Ms. Kattreh replied the new agreement was actually approved by the City Council in April and she would be more than happy to get her a copy of that.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Jones thanked staff for all of the work they’ve done with edible garden and community garden. She noted the community garden meeting was very well put together with respect to all of the paperwork they had for them to look at.

Member Jones asked for an update on both dome projects. Ms. Kattreh replied with regards to the golf dome they did receive a preliminary insurance settlement offer from the insurance company but they are still a ways apart. Their goal is to try to finish negotiations by the end of February and be able to take an offer and project plan to the City Council in March, start construction in April and open by November 1 at the latest. She added they are running on a very short time frame and they are doing the best that they can to negotiate the very best deal that they can.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board regarding the Sports Dome they are working on compiling the data they have collected from the athletic field users to determine outdoor athletic field needs. She noted it was a 15 to 20 page survey that they sent out to all of their field users asking them for current

field use needs, future field use needs and to really think outside the box not necessarily in the fields they are currently using but what type of space they will need. She stated their goal is to have the data compiled within the next month and will then have a plan ready to submit.

Member Deeds asked if there is a timeline on the sports dome to which Ms. Kattreh replied as soon as possible and noted they are working as fast as they can to try to put this data together.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board she is soliciting one or two volunteers to attend a March 19 City Council work session in conjunction with Blue Cross Blue Shield via Do.Town and they will present a “Health in all Policies” for the City. She explained what they would like to do is provide a health lens in evaluating projects to consider healthy and active living components for all projects that we implement in the future. She noted it’s a way to sustain the “Do.Town” concept in our daily business decisions. She indicated the Community Health Committee will attend the work session and they are also looking for representatives from Planning, Transportation and Park Board. Member Segreto volunteered to attend the work session.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that she has been approached by a resident interested in turning some of the hockey rinks into off-leash dog areas and asked the Park Board if this is something they would be interested in entertaining either now or in the future. Member Hulbert indicated they discussed doing that two years ago at Creek Valley and it was decided no because kids like to play soccer in those rinks during the summer as well as residents were concerned about the proximity to some of the homes. Member Segreto added there was also the issue with having people come from outside of the community and because it is so close to the school there was a safety factor. She indicated there are hockey rinks located in many different locations and this is not a proposal to use all of them so maybe one or two of them would work.

Member Deeds noted they strike him as way too small because it’s essentially concentrating a lot of dogs and a lot of what dogs leave behind in a relatively small space and added even large dog parks are a mess. It doesn’t seem on the surface as viable.

Member Hulbert asked where they are at with the dog park that exists but doesn’t exist on 42nd and France Ave.; on the Edina/Minneapolis border. Ms. Kattreh replied that property is owned by the City of Minneapolis and there have been discussions about that site many times over the years. She noted within the last year the City of Minneapolis contacted both St. Louis Park and Edina for a meeting to express a possible interest in selling that property to which they definitely expressed interest in hearing a little bit more but have not heard from them since. She stated they would definitely be open to that if they were approached.

Member Segreto stated that she would be open to the possibility of having a dog park on the east side of the City since Van Valkenburg Park is their only dog park and is all the way on the west side of Edina. Chair Steel commented she would like to pop into Pamela Park’s ice rink for ten minutes so her two small dogs could run around; however, she doesn’t want to have policing issues and have this be a formal location type thing. She indicated if there is any opportunity so residents could let their dogs run around for 15 minutes in a little more informal setting than the Van Valkenburg dog park. She noted she sees the Van Valkenburg dog park as more of a destination park, whereas Pamela Park would be you walk through, give your dog a little time to run around on its own and keep going.

Member Hulbert pointed out that anytime you talk about having a dog park near homes, which a lot of these hockey rinks are near homes, there is going to be a lot of people in opposition. He noted one possibility where there are no homes for a dog park would be York Park.

Member Gieseke indicated we have schools and hockey rinks and certain park facilities in certain areas for a reason. He stated he is a dog lover and owner but you are going to have some noises and other issues and there are reasons why they put dog parks in certain locations.

Member Deeds commented that unless there is some limitation you are going to put on it it's not going to be just small dogs, there are going to be big dogs too and that's why he questions the size of the hockey rinks. Chair Steel suggested they could put a limit on the number of dogs that could be in the rink at one time and that would also keep the noise down.

Member Jones stated that she thinks this should be an agenda item and also thinks they should limit the number of dogs allowed in at one time.

Member Kathryn Peterson noted that is fine as long as there are very tight parameters and as Member Segreto mentioned we are not talking about all of the parks because there are going to be a number of parks that are by schools and playgrounds and are going to have a number of limiting factors. Therefore, there are probably going to be relatively few hockey rinks that will be suitable.

Member Deeds suggested before it becomes an agenda item to find out if there are any rinks that are actually viable given the parameters. Ms. Kattreh replied she would be more than happy to put together a list and they can talk about it at their next meeting. Chair Steel asked Ms. Kattreh to also check with surrounding cities to see if this is something they do. Ms. Kattreh replied the resident who brought this forward did quite a bit of research and found there was one surrounding city that did allow it but it was only at one or two parks.

Member Gieseke commented that he would ask to keep an eye towards equal distribution throughout the city; something that would make sense on the east side if there is such a thing.

Member Jones asked if staff could also find out what additional maintenance would be needed and how it would work. Ms. Kattreh replied she will put together a list and they can have a brief discussion at their next meeting and decide how they would like to proceed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.